DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 174 047 FL 010 568

AUTHOR Cobaleda-Vega, Carmen; Walters, Joel
TITLE The Dual Language Model Reconsidered.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; Classroom Arrangement; *Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; Code Switching (Language); Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; English (Second Language); *Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Instructional Design; Language Dominance; *Language Instruction; *Language of Instruction; Second Language Learning; Spanish; Spanish Speaking; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS *Dual Language Model

ABSTRACT

Spatial and temporal factors in the bilingual classroom that can be manipulated to maximize the bilingualism of Spanish-speaking elementary school children (that is, to minimize their lexical code switching) are presented in terms of models. The advantages and disadvantages of the dual language teaching model are compared to those of two variations on that model. Homogeneous and heterogeneous seating arrangements are contrasted, and the physical grouping of materials and location of teaching aids such as bulletin boards are discussed. The importance of teacher-student communication during transition times (such as the period between lessons and the preparation for recess) for fostering bilingualism is emphasized, and two checklists are provided for assessing student and teacher language use at these and other times. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED174047

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joel Walters

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Dual Language Model Reconsidered[1]

Carmen Coballes-Vega
Joel Walters

University of Illinois

If we were to follow the natural course of events in a "bilingual" classroom, we would certainly observe many manifestations of the bilingual phenomenon. On the door to the room we might see the following:

door
puerta

In the area designated for music we might observe several latino records interspersed with records of American folk songs. As we enter the teacher instructs the class in the following manner:

> Now we're going to begin our math groups. Group one turn to page 43. Ahora empezamos los grupos de matemática. Encuentren ustedes del primer grupo la página 43.

Over in the classroom science area great care has been taken to label all instruments and materials in both languages. Additional observations would reveal some all-English interaction, some all-Spanish interaction and some code-switching and code mixing.

All of the examples represent variants of the general phenomenon known as bilingualism. The labeling examples above seem to have their precedent in bilingual societies which maintain road signs and information about basic services in two languages. The intent of this policy is not to teach either of the languages. Rather, it is to accommodate large numbers of speakers of each language with a form they can understand.

FL010568

© Carmen Coballes-Vega
Joel Walters

This is clearly not the intent of such a practice in the classroom. Furthermore, most bilingual classrooms in the United States are oriented to teaching language minority children the language of the majority rather than accommodating both groups in the same setting.

As Gaarder (1978) points out, the presence of two equivalent forms allows the individual to avoid the more difficult task - the task of becoming bilingual. In the case of the child who is asked to cope with a wide array of intellectual and social demands, the opportunity to tune out the demand for bilingualism is a welcome retreat. The oral translation of the instruction by the teacher has the same effect in the auditory domain. It allows the child to ignore the message in his weaker language because he comes to expect the instructional pattern which provides a translation for all critical material. This approach has demonstrated a high success rate in certain industrial arts classes of Calcutta which contain adults of two or more language groups none of whom understand each other.[2] In a classroom where the goals are aimed at bilingualism as well as achievement in the cognitive domain, widespread use of translation may interfere.

The observation cited above in which languages are mixed and switched deserves greater elaboration here. It is not the purpose of this paper to place a value on a phenomena which is a natural result of certain kinds of bilingualism. It is our purpose to try to delineate the contexts in which such a phenomenon might provide its greatest benefits. For this discussion we distinguish three types of language switching: borrowing, code-mixing and code-switching. Borrowing occurs, we will say, only at the lexical level. It results for one of two reasons. Either the speaker cannot access the lexical item in the language in which he is currently speaking, or he wishes to stylistically mark that particular item for which he changes languages.

Mother: Leo, siéntate, mira lo que estás haciendo. Estás tirando todo el milkshake. (Leo, sit down, look what you're doing. You're spilling all the milkshake.) (Valdés-Fallis, 1978:8) Code-mixing occurs at the level of a speaker's utterance and can result from the same two reasons. There's no children in the neighborhood. Well....sí hay criaturas (there are children). .....that has nothing to do con que le hagan esta..,(with their doing this). (Gumperz & Hernández-Chavez, 1972:88) Code switching occurs between speakers. In other words, the hearer responds in a language which differs from that of the speaker. Y le dije, I really don't want to go. Y me dijo, well I guess I can take Elsie. Así es que se fue y ya no lo vi. (And I said, I really don't want to go. And he told me, well I guess I can take Elsie. So he left and I didn't see him again.) (Valdés-Fallis, 1978:10) Sometimes this phenomonon occurs because the hearer cannot access a response in the language of the speaker. More often code-switching of this type establishes a sense of familiarity and ethnic solaridarity and serves a very distinct sociolinguistic purpose. (Gumperz & Hernandez-Chavez, 1972)

As far as the classroom is concerned, it seems that we would like to maintain the sociolinguistic uses of the three forms of code-switching. In terms of lexical access problems, however, it seems desirable in our goal of bilingualism to at least eliminate the child's weakness in retrieving and producing certain words and certain structures. The most efficient way to accomplish this goal would be to restrict certain code-switching phenomena to designated areas of the school or classroom, to specific speakers or to certain times of the day. The type of code-switching about which we are talking here are those that function as translation as in the examples given at the beginning of the paper. The rest of this paper will address spatial and temporal parameters which can and should be manipulated in maximizing the child's bilingualism.

CLASSROOM STRUCTURE

In the structural domain the variables which can be manipulated to maximize bilingualism are people and objects. Among the people which can affect the bilingual development of the children in the classroom are the teacher, the teacher's aide or co-teacher and the children themselves. The most obvious objects in the environment include the desks or tables of both the teachers and children, the communal space (floors, walls, blockboards and partitions) and the materials pertaining to the subject areas (e.g., language arts, math, social studies, science, art and music).

One of the most important educational decisions which affect bilingual children is the initial planning of the teachers about which language to use. The following taxonomy is offered as a beginning in that planning process and assumes the presence of a teacher and an aide in each classroom.

1. $Teacher_1$ - only Spanish[3]

   $Teacher_2$ - only English

2. $Teacher_1$ - only Spanish to Spanish dominant children
   English to others (balanced bilingual and English dominant children)

   $Teacher_2$ - the reciprocal

3. $Teacher_1$ - Spanish when initiating conversations

   $Teacher_2$ - English when initiating conversations

   Both respond in the language in which they are addressed.

Before advancing to some of the other structural factors which affect bilingualism it is advisable to point out some of the difficulties with each of the three approaches presented above. First, the most rigorous approach to handling the separation of two languages is a strict application of the dual-language model. (Gonzalez and Lezama, 1976) It has the advantage of making a very rigid distinction between the English and Spanish language models. It presumes, whether consciously or not, that adult language models provide the crucial

input for the acquisition and development of language. That assumption, in fact, has never been the most favored position for the fields of either first or second language acquisition. It carries with it the disadvantage of restricting a teacher from communication with children who do not command the basics of the language for which she is the model. Moreover, invariable differences in personality (as well as status) can bring about an imbalance in favor of one language or the other. Thus, an aggressive teacher who serves as the English-language model may shift the balance of acquisition toward her language. The opposite may also occur; an aggressive teacher who serves as the Spanish-language model may shift the balance of acquisition toward her language.

The second approach, in which one teacher speaks Spanish to the Spanish-dominant children and English to the others and the other teacher does the reciprocal, leaves the domain of the dual language. Rather than a model of one teacher for each language, we now have a model based on the child's language dominance as well as the teacher's designated language. The problems mentioned in association with the previous approach concerning restrictions on the teacher's freedom of interaction do not exist for this model. But, personality and status differences are not eliminated. In addition, the natural flow of interaction may be impeded, since teachers will need to stop and think about the child's language dominance before interacting. However, this problem may be overcome as the teacher becomes better acquainted with the language preference of the children.

Both this approach and the previous one raise another problem related to the role of the teacher as a language model. The problem centers on the language of interaction between the two teachers. This modeling behavior will likely affect the child's attitude toward the two languages

more than the modeling behavior between teacher and child. The effect on the child's attitudes toward language stem from the status ascribed to a particular language when adults speak that language among themselves. It seems to have more prestige than a conversation between a child and an adult.

The third approach also lies outside the domain of what could be labeled a dual language modeled. It also differs from the previous model in that it is not based on the child's language dominance. Rather, it combines the dual language model with one based on the child's language preference. One teacher initiates conversation only in Spanish while the other initiates only in English. Both respond in the language in which they were addressed. This eliminates two of the three objections to the previous approaches. Under this model the teacher is free to respond in whatever language the child initiates a conversation. This avoids cutting the teacher off from relationships with certain children in the class. No problem exists with respect to interaction between teachers, since both will respond in the language in which the conversation was initiated. The only problem remaining is related to the personality of the teacher and its effect on language use in the classroom. Since a more outgoing teacher may tend to initiate more interaction, there is a danger that one language may get more exposure than another. There is no easy solution to this problem or to any problem of language use, but some compensation for an imbalance in this domain by taking into account phenomena related to scheduling (to be discussed in the next section of this paper).

Since no language acquisition studies have yet investigated the role of input from peers it is difficult to make educational decisions based on the current state of research. It seems logical, however, to plan an environment in which children will receive the maximum exposure in their

weakest language. This would mean planning seating arrangements according to one of the following options.

1. Homogenous arrangements according to language dominance or preference
2. Heterogeneous arrangements
   a. Balanced - half Spanish-dominant; half English-dominant
   b. Skewed - three-quarters Spanish dominant with one-quarter English dominant child

As far as we know, arrangements of this type have never been manipulated in bilingual education classrooms, (or at least have never been reported in the literature). They are suggested here as guidelines in mapping out classroom seating arrangements in order to maximize bilingualism.

The homogeneous arrangement would "isolate" the Spanish-dominant children from the English-dominant ones. In a classroom with rows of desks or tables this could be accomplished by simply dividing the room in two parts. A variation on this arrangment might designate a separate area for balanced bilinguals or children with no language preference. A more decentralized classroom, divided into learning centers, might have two or more groups of children in each language dominance category. The main advantage lies in the ease with which the teacher can recognize a child's dominant language. The arrangement appears to follow naturally from the second approach to teacher models described above. A further benefit of this arrangement might stem from maintaining these language dominance groupings for instruction in subject areas such as language arts, reading, mathematics, science, etc. Its main drawback is clearly that the child will fail to get language exposure in his/her weaker language from other children in the class who are more able in that language. Since the significance of this type of language input has yet to be documented, it remains to be seen whether this is really a disadvantageous approach to grouping children.

The balanced heterogeneous arrangement, where each table of children or each quadrant of the room contains equal numbers of Spanish and English-dominant children, provides the input from peers that the previous arrangement does not provide. To conclude from the balanced seating arrangement that balanced bilingualism will result is to ignore all the other factors which contribute to language use (including the teacher, the materials and out-of-school exposure, among others). It is only one element of the classroom which requires planning and must be seen in this light.

The skewed arrangement is described above as it would be implemented in a language-maintenance bilingual program. Children who are weak in Spanish are placed in a seating arrangement with a group of children who are Spanish-dominant, expecting that the language of interaction will generally occur in Spanish. Similarly, a few children who are limited in English can be grouped with English dominant children. This arrangement will need to be adjusted throughout the school year in order to guarantee that Spanish and English-dominant children have the opportunity to develop their second languages. This arrangement could be implemented just as effectively in a transitional program but would require native English speaking children in the classroom with native Spanish speakers. The skewed seating arrangement also assumes that other factors will operate in favor of a particular language. Arranging for the child to have more input from his peers in the "other" language will assist, then, in the development of bilingualism.

The remaining structural factors in the classroom which appear to be critical in the development of bilingualism and biculturalism (about which we've said nothing) include the teachers' territoriality, classroom materials - both academic and extra-curricular and the wall and board space. The rationale for maintaining a distinction between languages in these domains differs somewhat from the earlier arguments for maintaining separate language input models.

Here we rely on research into the compound-coordinate dichotomy as the basis for planning separate language acquisition contexts within the classroom (Lambert, Havelka and Crosby, 1958). In general the compound bilingual acquires both languages in the same contexts and from the same people while the coordinate bilingual acquires her/his second language in a separate environment from the first, with different people providing the input and its origin coming sometimes at a later age. Compound speakers perform better on tasks involving translation and switching from one language to the next. Coordinates, on the other hand, have more of a functional separation between meanings in their two languages. In fact, those with distinctly bicultural experiences have an even greater separation than those who have acquired both languages in separate contexts in the same culture. It would seem, then, that coordinate bilingualism may be a more desirable goal from an educational perspective. Moreover, even if this construct is a false dichotomy, intuitive logic dictates that to develop skills to compete with both monolingual populations one must maintain separate language acquisition contexts for educational purposes.

No magic list of options exist for the remaining structural factors. This section is more of a plea that conscious planning go into the decisions which place materials and objects in a classroom. The placement of the teacher's and the aide's desk (or workspace) can be critical both from a general educational perspective as well as from the point of view of bilingualism. In terms of maximizing bilingualism, it can mean the difference between reinforcing or destroying the policy that has been established with respect to language models. A central location for the teacher with the more subdued personality may help compensate for the personality factor and provide more exposure to the language she is modeling. A related issue concerns the mobility of the teachers. Each teacher has to develop a style allowing

freedom of movement (or lack thereof). That movement needs to be checked by the role of the teacher as a language model as well as the needs of the children in the development of their two languages.

The question of materials is somewhat more difficult. Educational practice (whether in a traditional classroom or an open environment with learning centers) has tended to group material according to subject matter. Language arts and reading materials will be found in one place, math games in another, science activities in still another. The question arises: should all the activities in one language (or culture) be grouped separately from those in the other language? Certainly this will assist the child in maintaining the distinction between the two languages. It will also force the child to interact with an adult or a peer in order to clarify anything she does not comprehend. The only disadvantage to such a separation lies perhaps in the artificiality of the arrangement or the lack of efficiency in monitoring the child's progress. With extracurricular materials, the rationale for separation is more obvious. For example, a child can be encouraged to use English games if the teacher feels she needs more work in this language.

Similarly, it appears essential to maintain a distinction between the wall and bulletin board space allocated to each language. First, it avoids the tuning-out phenomena mentioned earlier where the child interacts only with written material in her/his preferred language. Second, it can serve also as a comforting arrangement. For the child who is exhausted from the struggle of learning a new language, an area of wall or bulletin board which she can relate to linguistically and culturally may provide a welcome respite from that struggle. In fact, an entire section of the room designated "North American", "Latino" or "Chinese" can provide the same advantage as well as an attractive cultural outlet.

TRANSITION TIMES

Rather than deal with which language to teach which subjects when (about which we have nothing really new to say), we will discuss here several phenomena which have gone unnoticed in the field of bilingual education. We are still concerned with language use in the bilingual classroom. At this point, however, we turn to temporal aspects of that classroom which can be manipulated to foster bilingualism. This section will first treat language use in the classroom and then go on to discuss planning for language use in other school-related activities.

Within the classroom some of the most critical language exposure a child receives is during what have been called "transition" times. These time segments include everything outside of the framework of content instruction. Among the most common episodes we include: moving to a lesson or activity such as a reading group; lining up; management episodes (both within and between lessons);request and response sequences such as when the child asks permission to get a drink, go to the bathroom, visit the nurse or play a game; and exchanges of greetings both at entry and exit times. The following outline may be helpful in monitoring teacher and child language use in bilingual classrooms:

Insert Checklist Here

Experiments conducted with bilingual and monolingual children indicate that the topic and setting of the conversation are much more important factors in language choice and in style choice than the characteristics of the listener (Walters, 1978). In other words, what you're talking about and where you're talking matters more in style choice than who you're talking to. Thus, if the bilingual teacher does not operate according to the principle

Teacher Language Behavior Checklist

	Native Language Use						English Use					
	Specify: _____ always	1	2	3	4	5 never	always	1	2	3	4	5 never
Lining Up To Move to an Activity		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Management												
a) within a lesson		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
b) between lessons		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Respond to Request												
a) bathroom		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
b) drink		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
c) office/nurse		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
d) play a game		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Morning Greeting		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5
Afternoon Farewell		1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5

What is the main factor controlling which language you use at a particular time?

a) Topic-lining up, discipline

b) Child's dominant language

c) Child's language preference

d) Which language you are addressed in

e) Where you are - near your desk, at door

f) Other explain:

of this research finding, the goals of bilingualism may be more difficult to attain.

In order to maintain a clear distinction between the two languages in a bilingual classroom and establish a temporal basis for separate language acquisition contexts, planning in this domain needs to be done very carefully. The parameters provided in the outline above can be designated for native language use or for second language use. Moreover, the designated language should be made explicit to the children in order to allow them to be more cognizant of the classroom policy. In fact, older elementray school children can readily participate in the planning process in their own classrooms.

In addition to an outline for planning teacher's language use, a similar set of parameters can be developed as an observation checklist to monitor the children's language behavior. Such a checklist, the beginning of which

---

Insert Checklist Here

---

is provided below, can be implemented by sampling the language use of particular children as a diagnostic/instructional tool. Alternatively, it can be used on a random set of children in a class or program as an evaluative instrument. It is our opinion that planning for language use must begin first with the teachers' behavior, however. In fact, affecting the child's language use patterns may be impossible except indirectly through the teachers' patterns and other aspects of classroom structure. Certainly demanding of children that they speak a particular language will not have any effect if teachers themselves are using both languages indiscriminantly.

Child Language Behavior Checklist

	Native Language Use	English Use	No Verbalization
Arrival			
Lining Up			
Response to Discipline			
a) within a lesson			
b) between lessons			
Response to Question			
a) within a lesson			
b) between lessons			
Requests			
a) bathroom			
b) nurse			
c) office			
d) drink			
e) game			
f) other:_____			
g) _____			
h) _____			
Departure			

In addition to beginning the planning with teachers, we feel that beginning in the classroom will create a greater impact than an attempt at language planning on the playground or in the school cafeteria. First it is probably healthy to leave recess and lunch time as open, uncontrolled environments for the sake of both child and teacher. Second, the presence of additional variables (e.g., other children, teachers, school personnel, different physical arrangements) makes planning a difficult if not impossible task there. On the other hand, for a child who is not interacting inside the classroom, the playground and cafeteria may be the only settings in which verbalization can be encouraged. In this case it seems essential to capitalize on this opportunity to affect the language input to the child.

Finally, it is necessary to comment briefly on the relationship between what we have been calling structural phenomena and what we have labeled temporal factors. The interface of both sets of factors can either strengthen or weaken the goals of bilingualism and language acquisition. Thus, merely planning which subjects will be taught in which language does not appear to be an adequate approach to the development of bilingualism. The classroom environment should be adjusted to language use patterns during "transition" times as well. That adjustment will necessarily be based on the goals set for the program and for individual children. For maintenance bilingualism, the environment and language use pattern during "transition" times will emphasize first language skills in order to compensate for the amount of English input in society. This, of course, will vary depending on the home and neighborhood background of the children in the class. Even for a transitional bilingual program, first language skills may need to be emphasized early in a child's schooling. This approach will allow the non-English-speaking child to make cognitive gains which might be unattainable until the first language has been fully developed. It is our opinion that

environmental parameters of the classroom and conscious planning of language use will contribute to the goals and objectives of quality bilingual education.

Footnotes

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented under the title "Maximizing Bilingualism Through Space and Time" at the annual meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, New York City, August 18, 1978.

2. Charles Ferguson (personal communication)

3. It is important to recognize that not every child brings the same dialect of Spanish to the classroom. A problem not discussed in connection with the dual language model is which dialect of Spanish (or for that matter, English) to use for instruction when the children come from heterogeneous backgrounds.

References

Gaarder, B. 1978. Golden Rules of Second Language Acquisition. NABE, II, (2), 59-60.

Gonsalez, J. and Lezama, J. 1976. The Dual Language Model: A Practical Approach to Bilingual Education. In J. E. Alatis and K. Thuaddel (Eds.) English as a Second Language in Bilingual Education. TESOL: Washington, D.C.

Gumperz, J. and Hernandez-Chavez, E. "Bilingualism, bidialectalism and classroom interaction." In C. Cazden, V. Jonn and D. Hymes, eds. Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Lambert, W., Havelka, J. and Crosby, C. 1958. The Influence of Language Acquisition Contexts on Bilingualism. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56, 239-244.

Valdes-Fallis, Guadalupe. "Code Switching and the Classroom Teacher" in Language in Education: Theory and Practice. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978.

Walters, J. 1978. Variation in the requesting behavior of bilingual children. Paper presented to the Fifth International Congress of Applied Linguistics (AICA). Montreal.